

Serial No. 10/777,024

REMARKS

Claims 1, 17, 19-21, 24 and 28-32 are elected subject to traverse.

The claims each include several common elements. As the Examiner will be familiar with the prior art relating to such common elements, it is efficient for the Examiner to consider all claims. Further, the elements not in common in the independent claims are presented in dependent claims such that searching and examination will require consideration of these elements also. Thus, as the Examiner must consider all features, it would be efficient to examine all claims reciting the features in different combinations.

As examples and as the Examiner relies on the temperature sensor of claim 19 (not present in claims 1, 17, 24, 28 and 29 of invention I) to distinguish over inventions II-IV, restraining movement is also recited in claim 15 of Group II. The mid link of invention II is recited in claims 30 and 32 of invention I and claims 25-27 of Group IV. Carrying common components of Group IV is recited in claim 30 of invention I and claim 16 of invention II. The handheld remote control of invention III is recited in claim 31 of invention I. Thus, each of the invention aspects are recited in a combination believed to produce synergistic results (see at least page 12, lines 22-24 of the present application). Furthermore, if the Examiner continues with the restriction requirement, the applicant reserves the right to present a single claim reciting all of the inventive aspects and/or to present further interlinking dependent claims.

Additionally, claims 18-21 have been already indicated as allowable and were previously recognized by the Examiner to be related with claims directed to pivotally supported gang mowers also recited in claims 1, 2 and 25 (see Office communication mailed January 6, 2005). As it is assumed that claims 18-21 were indicated as being allowed only after careful searching and thoughtful examination based upon the prior art, minimal effort is required to indicate the formal allowance of claims 18-21.

As the present action is not the initial action on the merits, the Examiner has previously recognized that the invention of claims 1, 2, 18 and 25 are related and examined them together. Additionally, the features of independent claims 1, 2, 18 and 25 were recited in the claims as originally filed and should have been searched and considered in the Office communication mailed January 6, 2005. Furthermore, the claims as amended differ only in the particular combinations of such previously searched and considered features.


Serial No. 10/777,024

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the restriction requirement should be withdrawn for each of these separate and independent reasons. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven A. Burke et al.

Dated: August 25, 2005.


Alan D. Kamrath, Reg. No. 28,227
NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A.
Attorneys for Applicants
900 Second Avenue South
Suite 820 International Centre
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Tel: (612) 392-7306
Fax: (612) 349-6556